

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/760,294	01/21/2004	Naoto Kusumoto	740756-2703	9855
22204	7590 04/18/2005		EXAMINER	
NIXON PEABODY, LLP 401 9TH STREET, NW			DOAN, TH	ERESA T
SUITE 900	EE1, IVW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20004-2128		2814	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				11/15		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments		10/760,294	KUSUMOTO, NAOTO			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Theresa T. Doan	2814			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apports. Or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reple of the provision of the provided above, the maximum statutory period or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a rep ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH e, cause the application to become ABAN	ly be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. 35 from the mailing date of this communication. NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		`				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 F	ebruary 2005.				
·		s action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowa		s, prosecution as to the merits is			
	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on 21 January 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ obj drawing(s) be held in abeyance tion is required if the drawing(s)	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d) .		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureausee the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in Apports Onity documents have been re U (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	olication No. <u>08/191,485</u> . eceived in this National Stage			
Attachmen		o∏				
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/28/05</u> .	Paper No(s)/l	nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rrmal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2814

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-16 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 12-20 of U.S. Patent No. 5,581,102. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because as follows: both U.S. Patent and instant application claimed a method for manufacturing a transistor device comprises a protrusion channel located between the source/drain regions. Moreover, the claim 12 in the U.S. No. 5,581,102 is either narrower version of the claims of the instant application or obvious variations thereof. For example, in claim 12 of U.S. No. 5,581,102 "... wherein thickness of the semiconductor layer in the source region and the drain region is made less than thickness of the semiconductor layer in the channel forming region by the etching step." (claim 12) and whereas claim 1 in the instant application claims "etch the conductive

Art Unit: 2814

film,... a semiconductor island..., so that the semiconductor island has a protrusion and edges of the gate electrode, the gate insulating film and the protrusion are substantially aligned with each other." (claim 1), that shows no different meaning between these two elements. The facts are that the claims of the U. S. Patent No. 5,581,102 and instant application have claimed the same goal and are not distinguished from each other.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 02/28/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that claim 12 of the Patent No. 5,581,102 is directed to an etching process for forming a gate electrode, a gate insulating layer and a protrusion portion of a semiconductor layer, the Patent No. 5,581,102 does not disclose or suggest that the edges of the gate electrode, the gate insulating film and the protrusions are substantially aligned with each other by the etching process. The argument is not persuasive because claim 12 of Patent No. 5,581,102 discloses the step of "etching the layer to serve as a gate electrode, the gate insulating layer, and a predetermined depth of a surface portion of the semiconductor layer using the mask by anisotropic etching in the vertical direction with respect to the substrate...". Therefore, the claim 12 of Patent No. 5,581,102 would inherently teaches the relationship between the gate electrode, the gate insulating film and the protrusion which are substantially aligned with each other by the etching process.

Art Unit: 2814

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Theresa T. Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-1704. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7:00AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WAEL FAHMY can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/760,294

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2814

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

TD April 6, 2005.

PHAT X. CAO
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5